

24 October 1960

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant Director, Basic Intelligence

SUBJECT: Comments on the Air Force Response to the Army  
Proposal for NIS Treatment of Geodesy

1. The Air Force statement that an NIS treatment of geodesy would duplicate existing publications and that the Army view on production allocation conflicts with JCS policy memoranda is not fully justified.
2. The assertion that intelligence on geodesy is adequately summarized in the two JCS plans and in the Defense 20-year geodetic plan is open to question on two considerations: the availability of these sources to the users of the NIS, and the adequacy of the treatment. The JCS memoranda referred to are classified top secret and therefore are not widely disseminated. For example, the CIA has not received copies of appropriate annexes of either of the two documents cited. The third document is not yet a formal issuance of the Department of Defense. It is doubtful that when and if issued it will have any extensive dissemination.
3. The treatment of geodesy in other US sources, including the Defense 20-year plan, does not really treat the problem in its intelligence context. For example, these reports usually do not include intelligence on the status of geodetic surveys as contrasted to the amount of data available to the US.
4. The Air Force objection to the Army proposed allocation of production responsibility is understandable and has been a point of contention for years despite numerous memoranda on the subject. The most recent JCS memorandum (copy attached) on the question allocated (para 3a) the responsibility for ground control to Army, but then excepts control for aeronautical and hydrographic charting. In our judgment the allocation and the exceptions are reasonable since each Service must tailor requirements and programs to their respective weapons systems and operations. Out of this emerge basic differences in interest and approach. The Army for its topographic maps must limit its interest to geodetic materials which meet accuracy requirements of conventional geodesy. The Air Force, on the other hand, has a broader interest with less rigorous requirements since its weapons system can

SUBJECT: Comments on the Air Force Response to the Army  
Proposal for NIS Treatment of Geodesy

tolerate positioning errors of  $\pm 1,000$  feet. Hence, each Service has not only obvious mutual interests, but reasonable diverse responsibilities that require differing standards, approaches, and priorities. These differences have been reflected in our previously suggested amendment to the Army proposal of production responsibility.

FOIAb3b

Chief, Geography Division  
Research and Reports

Attachment:

JCS Policy Memo 60  
dtd 8 Sep 59 (copy)

Distribution:

Orig. and 1 - Addressee  
1 - Ch/G  
2 - D/GG

RR/D/GG/ end

FOIAb3b

# MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

Attachments